Vector Curvaton without Instabilities

Konstantinos Dimopoulos,* Mindaugas Karčiauskas,† and Jacques M. Wagstaff‡
Physics Department, Lancaster University
(Dated: September 3, 2009)

A vector curvaton model with a Maxwell kinetic term and varying kinetic function and mass during inflation is studied. It is shown that, if light until the end of inflation, the vector field can generate statistical anisotropy in the curvature perturbation spectrum and bispectrum, with the latter being predominantly anisotropic. If by the end of inflation the vector field becomes heavy, then particle production is isotropic and the vector curvaton can alone generate the curvature perturbation. The model does not suffer from instabilities such as ghosts and is the only concrete model, to date, which can produce the curvature perturbation without direct involvement of fundamental scalar fields.

arXiv:0909.0475v1 [astro-ph.CO] 2 Sep 2009

There has been a recent outburst of activity in the cosmological implications of vector fields. In particular, the possible contribution of vector fields to the curvature perturbation ζ is receiving growing attention [1, 2, 3], with emphasis on characteristic signatures such as statistical anisotropy in the spectrum and bispectrum of ζ [4, 5, 6, 7]. The forthcoming observations of Planck satellite may well detect statistical anisotropy in the near future. On the theoretical side, it is a challenge to investigate whether the curvature perturbation can be generated without fundamental scalar fields. Even though theories beyond the standard model are abundant in scalar fields, no scalar field has ever been observed. The LHC may or may not confirm the existence of scalar fields. In the latter case it is imperative to find alternatives for the generation of ζ.

The pioneering work in Ref. [1] offered such a possibility by showing that a massive Abelian vector field alone can, in principle, generate ζ following the curvaton mechanism, originally introduced for scalar fields [8]. The only requirement is that some suitable mechanism breaks the conformality of the vector field during inflation, such that an (almost) scale invariant spectrum of vector field perturbations is generated. This was firstly attempted by introducing a non-minimal coupling to gravity, of the form $\frac{1}{6}RA^2$ [2]. In another attempt, a non-trivial variation of the kinetic function was considered [3]. However, in these early works on the vector curvaton, statistical anisotropy was ignored. But, as shown in Ref. [4], if particle production of the vector field perturbations is strongly anisotropic the statistical anisotropy in the spectrum can be excessive. In this case observational bounds force the vector field contribution to ζ to be subdominant. This was found to be the case for the $\frac{1}{6}RA^2$ model [4]. Moreover, the model was criticised for giving rise to instabilities, such as ghosts [9]. In view of these developments, here we reexamine the model of Ref. [3] taking statistical anisotropy fully into account.

A massive, Abelian vector field has Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = -\tfrac{1}{4} f F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \tfrac{1}{2} m^2 A_\mu A^\mu \,, \tag{1}$$

where f is the kinetic function and the field strength tensor is $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$. Eq. (1) can be the Lagrangian density of a massive gauge field. However, we need not restrict ourselves to gauge fields only. If no gauge symmetry is considered the Maxwell type kinetic term is motivated from being one of the few (three) choices [10] which avoids introducing instabilities, such as ghosts [9].

We assume that the contribution of the vector field to the energy budget of the Universe during inflation is negligible, i.e. inflation is isotropic. We also assume that, during inflation, $f = f(t)$ and $m = m(t)$.

The equations of motion for the vector field perturbations have been obtained in Ref. [3]. In Ref. [7] these are expressed in terms of the physical (in contrast to comoving) vector field W_μ, whose spatial components are $\boldsymbol{W} \equiv \sqrt{f}\,\boldsymbol{A}/a$, where $a(t)$ is the scale factor of the FRW metric. To study particle production we promote the perturbations of the vector field to a quantum operator:

$$\delta\hat{\boldsymbol{W}} = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_\lambda \left[\boldsymbol{e}_\lambda \hat{a}_\lambda w_\lambda e^{i\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}} + \boldsymbol{e}^*_\lambda \hat{a}^\dagger_\lambda w^*_\lambda e^{-i\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}} \right], \tag{2}$$

where $k \equiv |\boldsymbol{k}|$, $w_\lambda = w_\lambda(t,k)$ are the mode functions and $\lambda = L, R, \parallel$ with L, R denoting the Left and Right transverse polarisations respectively. The polarisation vectors $\boldsymbol{e}_\lambda(\hat{\boldsymbol{k}})$ can be chosen as

$$e_L \equiv \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, i, 0), \;\; e_R = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, -i, 0), \;\; e_\parallel = (0, 0, 1)\,, \tag{3}$$

with $\hat{\boldsymbol{k}} \equiv \boldsymbol{k}/k$. We consider canonical quantisation with $\left[\hat{a}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{k}), \hat{a}^\dagger_{\lambda'}(\boldsymbol{k}')\right] = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\boldsymbol{k} - \boldsymbol{k}')\delta_{\lambda\lambda'}$. The equations of motion for the mode functions are the same as the ones for the perturbations of the vector field, because the latter are linear. By solving these equations it is found that all the components of the vector field perturbations obtain a scale invariant spectrum if [7]

$$f \propto a^{-1\pm 3} \quad \text{and} \quad m \propto a \tag{4}$$

during inflation and $M_* \ll H$, where $M \equiv m/\sqrt{f}$ is the mass of the physical vector field and the star denotes the time when the cosmological scales exit the horizon.

*Electronic address: k.dimopoulos1@lancaster.ac.uk
†Electronic address: m.karciauskas@lancaster.ac.uk
‡Electronic address: wagstafj@exchange.lancs.ac.uk

In the following, unless otherwise stated, we focus on the case, when $f \propto a^{-4}$, which has the richest phenomenology. We will also assume that $f \to 1$ so that the vector field becomes canonically normalised at the end of inflation. Thus, if our vector field is indeed a massive gauge field, then the field remains weakly coupled during inflation because $f \sim 1/e^2$, where e is the gauge coupling.

The mode functions of the transverse components satisfy the equation [7]:

$$\left[\partial_t^2 + 3H\partial_t + \left(\tfrac{k}{a}\right)^2 (1+r^2)\right] w_+ = 0\,, \tag{5}$$

where $w_L = w_R \equiv w_+$ because the theory is parity invariant, and $r \equiv aM/k$, with $M \propto a^3$ during inflation. The solution to Eq. (5) is well approximated by [7]

$$w_+ = \begin{cases} a^{-\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4H}}\left[J_{\frac{3}{2}}(x) - iJ_{-\frac{3}{2}}(x)\right], & x \gtrsim 1 \gg z\,, \\ \frac{i}{\sqrt{2k}}\left(\frac{H}{k}\right), & x, z \ll 1 \\ a^{-\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4H}}\left[\frac{i}{C}J_{\frac{1}{2}}(z) + \frac{C}{3}J_{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)\right], & z \gtrsim 1 \gg x, \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

where $C \equiv \sqrt{x^3 z} = $ constant and

$$x \equiv k/aH \quad \text{and} \quad z \equiv M/3H\,, \tag{7}$$

which also implies $z \propto a^3$ and $r = 3z/x \propto a^4$. Subhorizon scales correspond to $x > 1$, while the field is light when $z \ll 1$ so scale invariance requires $z_* \ll 1$. For Eq. (6) we used the vacuum initial condition $\underset{x\to\infty}{w_+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}}e^{ix}$.

The mode functions of the longitudinal component satisfy the equation [7]:

$$\left[\partial_t^2 + \left(3 + \tfrac{8}{1+r^2}\right)H\partial_t + \tfrac{24H^2}{1+r^2} + \left(\tfrac{k}{a}\right)^2(1+r^2)\right] w_\parallel = 0\,. \tag{8}$$

Using the initial condition $\underset{x\to\infty}{w_\parallel} = \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2k}}e^{ix}$, the solution to the above is well approximated by [7]

$$w_\parallel = \begin{cases} -\frac{ia^{-\frac{7}{2}}}{3C^2}\left(\frac{k}{H}\right)\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4H}}\left[J_{\frac{5}{2}}(x) - iJ_{-\frac{5}{2}}(x)\right], & x \gtrsim 1 \gg z\,, \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}}\left(\frac{H}{k}\right)\frac{1}{z}\,, & x, z \ll 1, \\ a^{-\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4H}}\left[\frac{iC}{3}J_{\frac{1}{2}}(z) - \frac{1}{C}J_{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)\right], & z \gtrsim 1 \gg x, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where $\gamma \equiv \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{r^2}}$ is the Lorentz boost factor, which takes us from the frame with $\boldsymbol{k} = 0$ (where there is no distinction between longitudinal and transverse components) to that of momentum $\boldsymbol{k} \neq 0$.

From the above we can obtain the power spectra of the superhorizon perturbations as $\mathcal{P}_\lambda = \frac{k^2}{2\pi^2}|\underset{x\to 0}{w_\lambda}|$. Eqs. (6) and (9) suggest that, when $x \ll 1$, there are two regimes depending whether the vector field is still light at the end of inflation ($z \ll 1$) or not ($z \gtrsim 1$). If the field is light then the typical values of the perturbations are:

$$\delta W_+ = \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_+} = \frac{H}{2\pi} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta W_\parallel = \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_\parallel} = \frac{H}{2\pi}\frac{1}{z}\,. \tag{10}$$

Thus, in this case $\mathcal{P}_\parallel \gg \mathcal{P}_+$ and particle production is strongly anisotropic. On the other hand, if the field becomes heavy by the end of inflation, then Eqs. (6) and (9) can be written as

$$2\sqrt{\tfrac{H}{\pi}}\left(\tfrac{k}{H}\right)^{3/2} w_+ = \tfrac{i}{\sqrt{z}}J_{\frac{1}{2}}(z) + \tfrac{1}{3}x^3\sqrt{z}J_{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)\,, \tag{11}$$

$$2\sqrt{\tfrac{H}{\pi}}\left(\tfrac{k}{H}\right)^{3/2} w_\parallel = \tfrac{1}{3}x^3\sqrt{z}J_{\frac{1}{2}}(z) - \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{z}}J_{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)\,, \tag{12}$$

which, in the limit $z \gg 1$ and $x \to 0$, give

$$w_+ = \tfrac{i}{\sqrt{2H}}\left(\tfrac{H}{k}\right)^{3/2}\tfrac{\sin z}{z} \quad \text{and} \quad w_\parallel = -\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2H}}\left(\tfrac{H}{k}\right)^{3/2}\tfrac{\cos z}{z}. \tag{13}$$

Since $z \gg 1$, the frequency of oscillations is very large compared to the expansion rate H and we can use the average values of the power spectra over many oscillations

$$\overline{\mathcal{P}_+} = \overline{\mathcal{P}_\parallel} = \frac{1}{2z^2}\left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2 \Rightarrow \delta W_+ = \delta W_\parallel = \frac{H}{2\pi}\frac{1}{z\sqrt{2}}. \tag{14}$$

Therefore, if the vector field becomes heavy by the end of inflation, then particle production is isotropic.

As shown in Ref. [4], the contribution to the curvature perturbation spectrum from a vector curvaton field is

$$\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_A}(\boldsymbol{k}) = \frac{4}{9}\frac{\hat{\Omega}_A^2}{W^2}\left[\mathcal{P}_+ + (\mathcal{P}_\parallel - \mathcal{P}_+)(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{k}})^2\right], \tag{15}$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}} \equiv \boldsymbol{W}/W$, $W \equiv |\boldsymbol{W}|$ and $\hat{\Omega}_A \equiv \frac{3\Omega_A}{4-\Omega_A} \sim \Omega_A \equiv \rho_A/\rho$, where ρ_A is the density of the vector field. As in the case of the scalar curvaton paradigm, Eq. (15) should be evaluated at the time of decay of the curvaton field. Thus, we see that $\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_A}$ is isotropic only when particle production is isotropic and $\mathcal{P}_\parallel \approx \mathcal{P}_+$. In the opposite case, $\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_A}$ can be strongly isotropic. If this is so, the vector curvaton can only generate a subdominant contribution to ζ, with the dominant contribution coming from an isotropic source, such as a scalar field. The significance of the vector field in this case is confined to generating statistical anisotropy in the spectrum and bispectrum. In our model, the isotropy of $\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_A}$ is determined by whether or not the vector field is heavy by the end of inflation.

Statistical anisotropy in the spectrum can be quantified as [11]

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(\mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{\rm iso}(k)\left[1 + g\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}\right)^2\right], \tag{16}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{\rm iso}$ is the isotropic part, $\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}$ is the unit vector along a preferred direction and we kept only the leading term in the anisotropy. Currently, the data provide only a weak upper bound on the anisotropy parameter, namely $g \lesssim 0.3$ [11]. Using the δN formalism, we find [7]

$$g = \beta\frac{\mathcal{P}_\parallel - \mathcal{P}_+}{\mathcal{P}_\phi + \beta\mathcal{P}_+}\,, \tag{17}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\phi$ is denotes the spectrum due to an isotropic source, such as a scalar field ϕ, which must be dominant if $\mathcal{P}_\parallel \not\approx \mathcal{P}_+$. We also defined $\beta \equiv \left(\frac{N_A}{N_\phi}\right)^2$, where

$N_\phi \equiv \frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi}$ and $N_A \equiv |\boldsymbol{N_A}|$ with $N_A^i \equiv \frac{\partial N}{\partial W_i}$. N_ϕ and N_A quantify how much the elapsed e-folds are affected by the perturbations of the scalar and vector fields respectively.

Statistical anisotropy in the bispectrum of ζ generates anisotropic non-Gaussianity, which can be quantified by the non-linearity parameter, as

$$f_{\rm NL} = f_{\rm NL}^{\rm iso}\left(1 + g_{\rm NL}\hat{W}_\perp^2\right), \tag{18}$$

in analogy with Eq. (16), where $\hat{W}_\perp \equiv |\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\perp|$, with $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}_\perp$ being the projection of $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}$ onto the plane defined by the three $\boldsymbol{k}_{1,2,3}$ vectors, which determine the bispectrum.

For a parity invariant theory, we have [5]

$$\frac{6}{5} f_{\rm NL} = \beta^2 \mathcal{P}_+^2 \frac{3}{2\hat{\Omega}_A} \frac{1 + (p + \frac{1}{8}\kappa p^2)\hat{W}_\perp^2}{(\mathcal{P}_\phi + \beta\mathcal{P}_+)^2}, \tag{19}$$

where $\kappa = 0$ ($\kappa = 1$) in the local (equilateral) configuration and $p \equiv (\mathcal{P}_\parallel - \mathcal{P}_+)/\mathcal{P}_+$.

Let us discuss first the anisotropic case. This is realised if the vector field remains light until the end of inflation, i.e. $\hat{m} \ll H_*$, where $\hat{m}$ is the final (vacuum) value of the the vector field mass and H_* denotes the inflationary Hubble scale. If the field is light, $\mathcal{P}_\parallel \gg \mathcal{P}_+$. Thus, the contribution of the vector field to ζ must be subdominant. This means that $\beta \ll 1$ since the number of inflationary e-folds is primarily modulated by the scalar field. Hence, the anisotropy in the spectrum is $g \simeq \beta\mathcal{P}_\parallel/\mathcal{P}_+ = \beta/z^2$. For the bispectrum we have $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm iso} = 2\beta^2/\Omega_A$, where we considered $\Omega_A \ll 1$ and took $\mathcal{P}_\phi = \frac{H_*}{2\pi} = \mathcal{P}_+$. Since $p = z^{-2} \gg 1$ the anisotropic part of the bispectrum peaks in the equilateral configuration, where we find $g_{\rm NL} \simeq \frac{1}{8}p^2 \gg 1$. Therefore, non-Gaussianity is predominantly anisotropic in this case.

Let us now discuss the (almost) isotropic case. This corresponds to $\hat{m} \gtrsim H_*$, i.e. the vector field becomes heavy and begins oscillating by the end of inflation. In this case, $\mathcal{P}_\parallel \approx \mathcal{P}_+$ and excessive anisotropy in $\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_A}$ is avoided. Thus, we can dispense with the scalar field and consider $\mathcal{P}_\zeta = \mathcal{P}_{\zeta_A}$, i.e. the vector curvaton *alone* generates ζ. Consequently, $N_\phi \to 0$, i.e. $\beta \gg 1$. Then, from Eqs. (17) and (19), $g \simeq p \simeq g_{\rm NL}$, i.e. statistical anisotropy is equal in the spectrum and bispectrum and can be non-negligible only if $\hat{m} \sim H_*$. If $\hat{m} \gg H_*$ then $g = g_{\rm NL} = 0$ and ζ is isotropic. In this case, $f_{\rm NL} = f_{\rm NL}^{\rm iso} = 5/4\hat{\Omega}_A$ as in the scalar curvaton scenario [8].

From Eq. (16) it is evident that the magnitude of the contribution to curvature perturbation from the vector curvaton depends on the value of the zero mode W. It is easy to show that the equation of motion of W, under the conditions in Eq. (4), is [7]

$$\ddot{W} + 3H\dot{W} + M^2 W = 0 \tag{20}$$

during inflation, where the dot denotes time derivative. When $f \propto a^{-4}$ (i.e. $M \propto a^3$) and assuming initial energy equipartition between the kinetic and the mass terms in Eq. (1), we have [7]

$$W = W_0 \left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^{-3} \sqrt{2}\cos\left(z \pm \frac{\pi}{4}\right), \tag{21}$$

where '0' denotes initial values. Thus, the typical value of the zero mode scales as $W \propto a^{-3}$. From the above it can also be shown that the density of the vector field remains constant during inflation $\rho_A \sim M_0^2 W_0^2$ [7].

After inflation, f and m assume their final (vacuum) values and the equation of motion for W becomes [7].

$$\ddot{W} + 3H\dot{W} + (\dot{H} + 2H^2 + \hat{m}^2)W = 0\,. \tag{22}$$

From this, we can deduce that, if the field is still light after inflation, then $\rho_A \propto a^{-4}$, i.e. ρ_A is diluted as radiation, in contrast to the case of a light scalar field whose density remains constant. When $\hat{m} > H(t)$, the field becomes heavy and oscillates with frequency $\hat{m}$. Then, one can show that, on average, $\rho_A \propto a^{-3}$ and $P_i = 0$ [7], i.e. the field acts as pressureless *isotropic* matter and can dominate the Universe without generating excessive large-scale anisotropy, in accordance to the findings of Ref. [1]. Thus, it can safely play the role of the curvaton.

Working as in Ref. [2] and assuming prompt reheating, we obtain [7]

$$\frac{H_*}{m_P} \sim \Omega_{\rm dec}^{1/2}\,\zeta_A \left(\frac{\max\{\Gamma_A; H_{\rm dom}\}}{\min\{\hat{m}; H_*\}}\right)^{1/4}, \tag{23}$$

where $\Omega_{\rm dec}$ is Ω_A at the time of the vector field decay, ζ_A is the curvature perturbation attributed to the vector field, $H_{\rm dom}$ is the Hubble scale when the oscillating vector field dominates the Universe, if this occurs before decay, and $\Gamma_A = h^2\hat{m}$ is its decay rate, with h being the coupling to the decay products. The latter ranges as $\hat{m}/m_P \lesssim h \lesssim 1$, where the lower bound corresponds to decay through gravitational couplings.

Let us consider first the (almost) isotropic case, where $\hat{m} \gtrsim H_*$. Then, $\zeta \sim \Omega_{\rm dec}\zeta_A$ as in the scalar curvaton scenario. This implies $\Omega_{\rm dec} H_* \gtrsim \zeta^2 m_P$. Thus, we obtain

$$H_* \gtrsim 10^9 \text{ GeV}\,, \tag{24}$$

where we used $\zeta = 5 \times 10^{-5}$. Now, because $M \propto a^3$ during inflation, we have $\hat{m} = e^{3N_{\rm osc}} H_*$, where $N_{\rm osc}$ is the remaining e-folds of inflation at the onset of the vector field oscillations. Using this and considering gravitational decay, it can be shown that $N_{\rm osc}^{\rm max} = -\frac{4}{9}\ln\zeta = 4.4$ [7]. Thus, the parameter space for this scenario is

$$1 \lesssim \hat{m}/H_* < 10^6. \tag{25}$$

The above range is somewhat reduced if the decay of the curvaton is more efficient than gravitational. Indeed, when $h \sim 1$ the upper bound is reduced by $\mathcal{O}(10^2)$ since $N_{\rm osc}^{\rm max} = -\frac{2}{3}\ln\Omega_{\rm dec} \lesssim 3.1$, where $\Omega_{\rm dec} \gtrsim 10^{-2}$ because a smaller $\Omega_{\rm dec}$ violates the current observational bounds on $f_{\rm NL} = 5/4\hat{\Omega}_{\rm dec}$. Therefore, the parameter space where

the vector field undergoes isotropic particle production and can alone account for ζ is exponentially large.

Let us consider now the anisotropic case, where $\hat{m} \ll H_*$. Then, it can be shown that $\zeta \sim g^{-1/2}\Omega_{\rm dec}\zeta_A$ [7]. A lower bound on $\hat{m}$ is obtained due to the requirement that the vector curvaton decays before big bang nucleosynthesis $\Gamma_A > T_{\rm BBN}^2/m_P$, where $T_{\rm BBN} \sim 1$ MeV. Hence, we get

$$H_* > \sqrt{g}\, 10^7 \text{ GeV} , \tag{26}$$

while the parameter space for this scenario is

$$10 \text{ TeV} \lesssim \hat{m} \ll H_* . \tag{27}$$

Before concluding let us briefly discuss also the case when $f \propto a^2$ in which too a scale invariant spectrum of all the components of the vector field perturbations is attained. In this case $M =$ constant throughout inflation. Thus, we have $\hat{m} = M_* \ll H_*$. It turns out that Eq. (10) is also valid in this case, but crucially $1 \gg z =$ constant, which means that $1 \ll \mathcal{P}_\parallel/\mathcal{P}_+ =$ constant. Thus, particle production is always strongly anisotropic. The predictions for g and $g_{\rm NL}$ are identical with the case when when $f \propto a^{-4}$. The zero mode satisfies Eq. (20) but initial energy equipartition suggests that $W = W_0 =$ constant during inflation, which also implies that $\rho_A \sim M_0^2 W_0^2$. Since the evolution after inflation is insensitive to the scaling of f during inflation, the bounds from the curvaton mechanism are the same with those in the anisotropic case discussed above for $f \propto a^{-4}$ (e.g. Eqs. (26) and (27) remain valid). All in all the predictions of our model for $f \propto a^{-1\pm3}$ are identical, when $\hat{m} \ll H_*$, while the possibility that $\hat{m} \gtrsim H_*$ can only be realised when $f \propto a^{-4}$.

In conclusion, we have presented and analysed a new model of vector curvaton field, which does not suffer from instabilities such as ghosts. The model corresponds to a massive Abelian vector field with a Maxwell type kinetic term, whose kinetic function and mass scale during inflation according to Eq. (4). The implications of our model depend on whether the field is light or not by the end of inflation If it is light, then particle production is anisotropic. In this case, the vector curvaton's contribution to the curvature perturbation must be subdominant with the dominant part due to some isotropic source such as a scalar field. However, the vector field can generate statistical anisotropy in the spectrum, which could be observable. It also generates anisotropic non-Gaussianity along a direction correlated with the statistical anisotropy in the spectrum. In fact, the anisotropy in the bispectrum is dominant to the isotropic part, which means that, if a non-Gaussian signal without angular modulation is indeed observed e.g. by the Planck mission, our model will be falsified in this case. However, in the case when the field becomes heavy by the end of inflation, particle production becomes isotropic. Then, the vector curvaton's contribution to the curvature perturbation can be dominant. Indeed, we can dispense with contributions from other sources such as scalar fields and consider that *the vector curvaton alone generates the curvature perturbation in the Universe*. If there is some residual statistical anisotropy, we have shown that its magnitude is the same in both the spectrum and bispectrum, which is a characteristic signature of this possibility. However, if the vector field is much heavier than the Hubble scale by the end of inflation, any anisotropy is negligible and the implications of the vector curvaton are indistinguishable to the scalar curvaton scenario. We have found that there is ample parameter space for both the above cases (see Eqs. (25) and (27)).

The curvature perturbation spectrum obtained is exactly flat. We can get a red spectrum (currently favoured by the data) by assuming that inflation is not exactly de Sitter, with $\varepsilon \equiv -\dot{H}/H^2 \sim 10^{-2}$. The model needs to be tuned according to Eq. (4), but this has to be contrasted with the unavoidable fine-tunning of scalar field models (η-problem). Our model may be realised in the context of supergravity (supermassive gauge fields) or superstrings (vector fluxes in the bulk).

This work was supported (in part) by the UniverseNet Network MRTN-CT-2006-035863 and by STFC Grant ST/G000549/1. M.K. and J.M.W. are also supported by the Lancaster University Physics Department.

References

[1] K. Dimopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 083502.

[2] K. Dimopoulos and M. Karčiauskas, JHEP **0807** (2008) 119.

[3] K. Dimopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 063506.

[4] K. Dimopoulos, M. Karčiauskas, D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, JCAP **0905** (2009) 013.

[5] M. Karčiauskas, K. Dimopoulos and D. H. Lyth, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 023509.

[6] S. Yokoyama and J. Soda, JCAP **0808** (2008) 005; S. Kanno, M. Kimura, J. Soda and S. Yokoyama, JCAP **0808** (2008) 034; M. a. Watanabe, S. Kanno and J. Soda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 191302; N. Bartolo, E. Dimastrogiovanni, S. Matarrese and A. Riotto, 0906.4944 [astro-ph.CO].

[7] K. Dimopoulos, M. Karciauskas and J. M. Wagstaff, 0907.1838 [hep-ph].

[8] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Lett. B **524** (2002) 5; T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **522**, 215 (2001) [Erratum-ibid. B **539**, 303 (2002)]; K. Enqvist and M. S. Sloth, Nucl. Phys. B **626** (2002) 395.

[9] B. Himmetoglu, C. R. Contaldi and M. Peloso, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 063517; Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 111301.

[10] S. M. Carroll, T. R. Dulaney, M. I. Gresham and H. Tam, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 065011; T. R. Dulaney, M. I. Gresham and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 083510 [Erratum-ibid. D **79** (2009) 029903].

[11] N. E. Groeneboom and H. K. Eriksen, Astrophys. J. **690** (2009) 1807.